



November 1, 1999

Theodore John Kaczynski
04475-046
P.O. Box 8500
Florence, CO 81226-8500

Dear Ted,

I received letters 90 and 90a yesterday, as well as your letter of termination to which Miller has responded.

You will remember that I stated some time ago that the James Brooke story on monkey-wrenching was a positive piece. I said this for many reasons that were not apparent to you, since the most readily apparent *negative* element was the mention of Chris Waits's book. I cited the for instance of the headline; the fact that "Kaczynski" was used instead of Unabomber. It meant to me that you were being discussed as an individual, not a caricature. This was a small detail, but meaningful with regard to the way the media work. In addition, the article lent credence to the fact that you were involved in local political actions, and thus that the Unabom crimes were not the acts of a "sicko", but rather a political activist. It was a small step in the right direction with regard to what I thought you wanted to achieve by publishing your book. I am now resolved to *not* think about what you might want to achieve (since you have asked me as much), and to not comment on the book beyond what will be necessary for publicity.

To continue, the distinctions I made about that article were minute, but important. The media rely on nuance to say things that do not reflect status quo values, on the rare occasions that they have something to say that challenges common mores. They can only articulate "dangerous ideas" (such as the possibility that an intelligent person who claims to be sane might resort to violence to address societal ills) if they disguise such sentiments behind a veil of social propriety. As with all propaganda, the real message is located between the lines. This fact about the media had some bearing on the manner in which Dubner's article was published. Another factor that is more readily discernible would be the fact that it is a piece of mainstream journalism, and represents the fairest treatment you have received regarding your person, not the trial.

You asked me to explain how the statements that I made about the proposed article were fulfilled in the article that ran in *Time*. You also requested permission to cite my letters. I will first address the latter. You may neither cite the letters you asked about nor the present one, since I have my own interests attached to their publication as part of a larger collection that ~~have~~ *has*

nothing to do with your project. We might discuss the possibility of permission at a more appropriate juncture, but only were you to cure the contractual breach with regard to the publication of *Truth versus Lies* by Context Books. Now, I will respond to the specific quotations and then move on to some more detailed points.

(Citation from 7/19/99, page 2, ¶ 2): The provisional title (which would have been the title had there been one) can be found on p. 46, col. 1, ¶ 1. The piece is more critical of David and Linda than anything else to date, and it is particularly hard on Linda (see p. 48, col. 2, ¶ 1-3). The angry Buddhist comment that Dubner made is implied there by the manner in which he describes them. Also Dubner received a letter from your brother that is plaintive, which would suggest that he feels the treatment he received was not as you perceive it.

(Citation from 8/2/99, page 1, ¶ 5): On p. 47, col. 1, ¶ 6 and p. 48, col. 1, ¶ 2, Dubner briefly mentions David's "radicalism," but as I said in the 8/2 letter, this was ancillary to his argument, since he was more interested in the triangulation between you, David and Linda. Also: you told Dubner that my notion about David's radicalism was incorrect, so he dismissed it as such.

(Citation from 8/7/99, page 1, ¶ 2): This paragraph makes sense in light of the second paragraph of this letter, and within the limits of mainstream journalism, the editor and Dubner did create the piece we discussed. I do not claim to have been suckered by Dubner, nor do I think that he suckered you. The article does make it clear that you "developed your own code of values and beliefs", although it does not hold this code to be laudable or positive (e.g., the details of your personal evolution being attributed to sexual starvation, isolation, resentment and humiliation). I did not know these details formed part of the thesis until the article was published, not could I have known. While the article does not at all argue that your belief system is cogent, it does give you credibility on p. 49, col. 2, ¶ 1-4, where you are portrayed favorably. First, Dubner quotes your sarcastic comment about your optimism regarding life in general, and then he quotes at length your comments about living in the woods. In between the lines, this does tend to make your system of belief seem rational and cogent.

Some time ago, you said that the readers to whom you have addressed *Truth versus Lies* would find the book without any publicity. You wrote that they would understand the importance of setting the record straight, and that you did not care about any other readers. I bring this up because while members of the alt.fan.unabomber site mostly complained that the article had no news in it, a few commented that the article did surprise them inasmuch as the above mentioned paragraphs on the last page of the article allowed you the chance to voice your position, however briefly. I am enclosing *Time's* "Letters to the Editor", which contains responses to the article. To give you some further indication of the positive nature of the article and other press that has come out since we began pre-publicity for *Truth versus Lies*, I would point to the approval of your COA, which could only have benefited from the above.

(Citation from 8/7/99, page 1, ¶ 3): The article is not far from what Dubner claimed it would be. He does discuss morality, but not in any significant way. He does not discuss David's supposed

radicalism, because you told him that this was not a valid point. The article does mention that David and Linda “were upset” (p. 46, col. 2, ¶ 2) when Dubner started to pursue your side of the story (“David and Linda were recalcitrant”). What Dubner did not specify was the manner in which he would shade the piece. I had no way of knowing this before it was published.

(Citation from 8/7/99, page 2, ¶ 2): Everyone was surprised to find out that *Talk* not only did not want to “break the story about your brother’s wishy-washy morals” including Dubner (who pulled his piece) and Lisa Chase (who resigned). I was personally surprised after reading the piece that there had been any problem with the stance it took, since it is not very forceful in the portrayal of your brother’s character. But this further suggests the importance of nuance and shading in the eyes of editors in the mainstream.

(Citation from 8/7/99, page 2, ¶ 4): I still think that Dubner is on a par with Finnegan, both as a writer and intellect. It is obvious that the article does not represent “a changing of the tide”. I cannot account for the manner in which he wrote about you, since that is a question for him to answer. I agree “that he designed the article to suit his own journalistic purpose rather than to give the best attainable approximation to the truth.” I would only point out that he was commissioned to write an article for a journalism-based publication, that he was not working for you, and he did report the highest attainable approximation to the truth given his situation. With regard to his appearance on the *Today Show*, what he said was limited to the second paragraph of the first column on page 46.

(Citation from 8/7/99, page 3, ¶ 3): This material was not used, although Dubner did speak at length to me about the manner in which the . . . sections of your book fascinated him.

With regard to what you see as the insulting portrayal of you and the saintly portrayal of David and Linda, p. 46, col. 1, ¶ 2, describes your voice as “singsongy” and remarks that your “upbeat manner hardly resembles that of the man . . . infamy.” The entire paragraph, which comes early in the piece, is not insulting—except for the infantilizing remark about torturing flies—and besides the comment I made on Court TV (I said you were nice), Dubner is the only other person in the mainstream to say that you 1.) seemed sane and 2.) were affable. In the next paragraph, he does put everything in your own terms without providing substantiating evidence of your sanity with his own observations, but this paragraph follows his own portrayal of you as an affable person with no abnormal affects.

Far from reading the article in a lazy manner, I read it very closely. I would guess that the accusations against David are put in your own words because you know him better than Dubner, whose job as a journalist is to report the facts as related to him by his sources. Dubner cites a lack of perspective in your writing because the bombings were something that most people abhor, and they are not addressed directly or indirectly. It seems clear that Dubner felt that the bombings had to be stopped, and that your brother was faced with a moral dilemma. In this respect he lauds your brother. But he immediately says: “the original tale had been so much neater” (p. 46, col. 1, ¶ 7) and that “even the most righteous intentions have created shadows.”

He clearly states that he had originally thought of David as a saint, but later began questioning David's motivations. This is his statement and it judges David harshly; it is not a citation from the interview with you or from your book.

Dubner does place David on the moral high ground throughout, but he also allows you the chance to give your opinion about his decision to turn you in (i.e., that David should have kept it to himself). Also: At both p. 48, col. 2, ¶ 4 and p. 49, col. 1, ¶ 3-4, Dubner portrays both Linda and David as suffering from emotional, or at least egotistical, avarice vis-à-vis their interest in the attention they received for turning you in. His portrayal of Linda gagging herself with her finger is accompanied, in the following paragraph, by an aspersion cast: "I had expected... a more united front." The second citation provides a rather damning view of David's vanity. Later, he cites your thoughts about going on the lecture circuit, and thus he equates David with you (and then neither of you is shown in a positive light). I understand this is not the best or most empathetic of possible portrayals, but it is a lot better than you have received elsewhere, with the exception of Finnegan's piece, which was not about your personal history.

But enough of that. I do not at all mind writing to you about the *Time* article, but it should have absolutely nothing to do with the publication of your book. This is of course not the case, which brings us to a conversation that he become inevitable. I await your response to Context's denial of your termination of contract on the grounds that it was ineffective in several ways.

My best,
Brian.